

## REMARKS

The Office Action dated November 21, 2005 has been received and carefully noted. The following remarks are submitted as a full and complete response to the Office Action.

Claims 1-23 are respectfully submitted for consideration.

The Office Action rejected claims 1-23 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over US Patent No. 6,577,622 to Schuster et al. (Schuster), in view of US Patent No. 6,870,916 to Henrikson et al. (Henrikson). The Office Action took the position that Schuster disclosed all of the features of these claims, with the exception of allocating by means of the server a network address identifying a resource capable of sustaining the conference call. The Office Action asserted that Henrikson disclosed this feature. Applicant respectfully submits that the cited references taken individually or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest all of the features of any of the pending claims.

Claim 1, from which claims 2-11 depend, recites a method for administering conferencing resources in a communications system having a plurality of terminals and a conference server. The method includes transmitting from a first terminal to the server a first message comprising a request for a resource capable of sustaining a conference call. The method also includes allocating, by means of the server a network address identifying a resource capable of sustaining the conference call and transmitting from the server to the first terminal a second message comprising the network address.

Claim 12, from which claims 13-23 depend, recites a conference server for administering conferencing resources in a communications system having a plurality of terminals. The conference server includes a receiver unit for receiving from a first terminal a first message comprising a request for a resource capable of sustaining a conference call, an allocation unit for allocating a network address identifying a resource capable of sustaining the conference call, and a transmission unit for transmitting to the first terminal a second message comprising the network address.

As discussed in the present specification, embodiments of the present invention enable the setting up of conference calls on communications systems. The feature of providing a message containing the network address of a conferencing resource is advantageous since it overcomes shortcomings of prior art solutions such as those described in the prior art (see page 2, first full paragraph to page 3, penultimate paragraph of the present application). The Applicant respectfully submits that the present claims recite features that are neither disclosed nor suggested in the cited references.

Schuster is directed to a system and a method for using a portable information device. Schuster describes a number of examples of methods by which conference calls can be set up between three users. The methods are described in the context of the SIP protocol, in which there are two major architectural elements: the user agent and the network server (column 9, lines 5-6). In Figures 8A-10A, a calling user agent is represented by a data network telephone 208 and a PID 210. In Schuster, three specific embodiments for conference call set-up are discussed. Figures 8A, 9A and 10A and the

corresponding portions of the description at column 18, line 32 to column 19, line 25, column 20, line 15 to column 21, line 18 and column 22, line 14 to column 23, line 16 illustrate the details of the methods described in Schuster.

Hendrickson is directed to a multimedia communications system and conferencing arrangements. Specifically, Hendrickson describes a system in which a conference establishment server receives from a first user a request for a conference, the request including details of the required conference such as participants, resources and rules.

Applicant respectfully submits that the cited references fails to disclose or suggest at least the feature of transmitting from a first terminal to the server a first message comprising a request for a resource capable of sustaining a conference call, as recited in claim 1 and similarly recited in claim 12.

Instead, at best Schuster merely describes that the first and second embodiments (Figures 8A and 9A) require the first data network telephone to transmit INVITE requests to the network elements at which the parties are located (column 18, lines 56-60 and column 20, lines 40-44 of Schuster). In the third embodiment (Figure 10A), the first data network telephone transmits an INVITE request to the conference server, which then transmits INVITE requests to the second and third data network telephones (column 22, lines 42-48). There is no mention of transmitting an address of a conferencing resource. Henrikson fails to cure this deficiency.

Further, Applicant respectfully submits that the cited references fail to disclose or suggest at least the feature of transmitting from the server to the first terminal a second

message comprising the network address, as recited in claim 1 and similarly recited in claim 12.

Instead, at best, Schuster (column 9, lines 33-34 of Schuster) relates not to a network address of a conferencing resource but instead to a network address of a user. At column 9, lines 28-31 of Schuster, it is described that the user identifiers in SIP requests are known as SIP addresses, and that SIP addresses are referred to as SIP URLs. Subsequently, the redirect servers process an INVITE message by sending back the SIP URL where a callee is reachable. Thus, the SIP URL referred to in Schuster is merely a network address of a user.

Still further, Applicants submit that the cited references fail to disclose or suggest at least the feature of allocating by means of the server a network address identifying a resource capable of sustaining the conference call, as recited in claim 1 and similarly recited in claim 12. Specifically, Applicant respectfully submits that Henrikson fails to cure the admitted deficiencies of Schuster.

As discussed above, Henrikson merely discloses that the server then identifies an available resource and a suitable time for the conference, and transmits the conference time to the participants. (See column 1, line 66 to column 2, line 15 and column 2, lines 26-37 of Henrikson). There is no disclosure or suggestion in Henrikson that a message identifying a network address of a conferencing resource should be sent to any of the terminals as recited in the pending claims. Thus, Henrikson fails to cure the admitted deficiencies of Schuster.

Applicants respectfully submit that because claims 2-11 and 13-23 depend from claims 1 and 12 respectively, these claims are allowable at least for the same reasons as claims 1 and 12. Applicant further submits that the cited references fail to disclose or suggest all of the features of these dependent claims.

Based at least on the above, Applicant respectfully submits that the cited references, taken individually or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest all of the features of claims 1-23. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-23 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) is respectfully requested.

Applicant respectfully requests that each of claims 1-23 be allowed and this application passed to issue.

If for any reason the Examiner determines that the application is not now in condition for allowance, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner contact, by telephone, the applicant's undersigned attorney at the indicated telephone number to arrange for an interview to expedite the disposition of this application.

In the event this paper is not being timely filed, the applicant respectfully petitions for an appropriate extension of time. Any fees for such an extension together with any additional fees may be charged to Counsel's Deposit Account 50-2222.

Respectfully submitted,



---

David E. Brown  
Registration No. 51,091

**Customer No. 32294**  
SQUIRE, SANDERS & DEMPSEY LLP  
14<sup>TH</sup> Floor  
8000 Towers Crescent Drive  
Tysons Corner, Virginia 22182-2700  
Telephone: 703-720-7800  
Fax: 703-720-7802

DEB:jkm